taken up and passed at a meeting on Wednesday, the 3rd of Dhanu 1105.

Question put and agreed to.

Resolutions on Matters of General Public Interest.

1. Diversion of water from the Karuvannur river.

President.—Next resolutions. The first resolution stands in the name of Mr. C. J. Mathew.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—Sir, I rise to move "*that in view of the great sufferings caused by successive floods from the Manali and Kurumali rivers, this House recommends to the Government to take up at once the scheme of the diversion of water from the Karuvannur river*".

You, Sir, the Hon'ble Member for Revenue, the permanent Chief Engineer and the Commissioner of Police are all eye-witnesses to the great amount of destruction wrought by the recent floods. You also know with what amount of worry, anxiety and deep concern you all watched the daily increase of water from hour to hour and moment to moment. You all tried also your very best to prevent the flood, if possible, by effective and timely action taken then and there. But, Sir, we all know too well the principle that a stitch in time saves nine. Any amount of alert measure taken at that particular hour would be absolutely of no avail as we have already seen. So, let us see what effective measures we ought to take now in order to bring in real relief.

Now, with regard to the extent of the destruction—to make but a small estimate of it—I understand 16,000 acres of paddy fields in the areas bordering the Manali and the Kurumali rivers are seriously affected. Nearly 1,50,000 inhabitants are injured. And these are paddy fields which would ordinarily yield about 300 lakhs of *paras* of paddy. All these are totally destroyed and ruined by these recurring floods every year round. Just now we were told that about 8,000 rupees had to be distributed among the poorest of the people who lost their homes and everything. All these would clearly convince the House that some effective measure ought to be set on foot now and at once. This matter had been urged by this House from its very inauguration, as we shall find, if we look into the past records. The Chief Engineer had dealt with this question at length (vide appendix to the questions and answers of the Budget Session of 1102). He says :—

"The problem presented is one of drainage. The main drainage courses in question are the Manali and Kurumali rivers which are characteristic hill-streams and torrential in nature. The Karuvannur river at certain places could, during ordinary floods, discharge not more than 10,000 cusecs of water while the catchment area would yield about 30,000 cusecs. This is about 3 times more than the capacity of the ordinary drainage. *So unless*

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

this water is diverted from the Karuvannur river there is absolutely no relief available for these recurring floods". And lower down he says: "As a solution of this flood problem, however, I propose the following:—To cut a canal from the Karuvannur or Manali river above Arrattupula which would all along pass through a deep width of high land and empty into the *kole* lands. In this case it may be noticed that *even the greatest of floods* would not affect the sides of the canal, and even if the canal overflows, the damage done would be ever so very small." In this scheme, he has made allowances even for the *greatest of floods* and he has unmistakably said that the only possible solution would be *to cut a canal from the Karuvannur river*. Now, let us turn our attention to the answers given to-day by the Member for Engineering to question No. 22. This is the question: "How far the scheme for the diversion of the waters of the Manali and the Kurumali rivers has progressed and what are the reports of the Special Irrigation Officer and the Chief Engineer about this and what are the reasons for not taking up the work last year". The answer is: "Estimates for the diversion of the Manali river at Marathakara and the Karuvannur river at Palakkadavu were prepared before the abnormal floods of 1104. *After the floods, it was found advisable to revise them.* Also it is proposed to take up these works after watching the effect of the diversion from the Muriyad lake which will be useful for navigation also." In the statement I read before the Chief Engineer had made allowances even for the greatest of floods, and now how can he say that the abnormal floods of last year brought about a new change? Granting even the greatest flood would come, he said, the only course left open for the Government to effect relief would be to cut open a canal from the Karuvannur river. "The recent flood has made it necessary to revise the scheme" *How* ? And *why* ? Let me read out his statement once again: "In this case it may be noticed that even the greatest of floods would not affect the sides of the canal, and even if the canal overflows, the damage done would be ever so very small. The Chirakkal *thodu* which was cut through high lands is one from which we may well take an example in that it presents no danger due to floods. I have not exactly located my alignment but I have ordered a survey to be done and would be able *to put forth a definite scheme* before preparing my budget for next year." And, Sir, you will find he put forth a definite scheme and provided for a lakh and odd of rupees in the budget to take up this work.

In answering the question during the Budget Session of 1104 as to whether the Government will be pleased to state if any amount out of the budgetted allotment of a lakh of rupees was spent for irrigation works in 1104 and as to the other works proposed to be started this year, he said that no amount has been expended and that the *work proposed to be started was the diversion of the Karuvannur river to the Trichur lake*. Thus he put forth a definite scheme after causing an investigation to be properly conducted by a special staff of Engineers. He came to the definite conclusion that the Pallisseri diversion of the Karu.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

vannur river had to be taken up in hand as a flood-relief measure. After having committed himself this way and after having definitely answered in this House in favour of the Karuvannur diversion, one can't imagine why this scheme stands practically abandoned to-day.

The Department for Engineering might now turn round and say that they had not sufficient technical knowledge then to lay out a definite plan which would effectively bring about the flood relief. But in his budget speech in 1102 the Chief Engineer had stated:—"We have also further recognised the importance of irrigation by proposing a separate Irrigation Department to make *final investigations into some of the important schemes which have been pressed on our Government by the people for a long time.* Judging by histories of big irrigation projects, one will notice that none is developed and brought into execution as soon as it is conceived. Hydraulic data requiring few years of observation are necessary before a system could be reported on". Our Chief Engineer had thus caused *final investigations* to be made, and unless there were sufficient data, he would not have committed himself to a particular scheme. A Special Irrigation Department was established and that particular Department was set to work. I understand the Special Engineer who was in charge of this Special Department did submit his scheme in favour of the Pallisseri scheme, and it was on the strength of his report that the Chief Engineer had come to this conclusion. "Irrigation projects" will take time and it did take time till 1104. The Chief Engineer goes on:—"Our only justification is that we have not been callous to the development of irrigation." Very good—let us see.

"This year we have investigated the question of the diversion of the Manali river and formed our definite conclusions regarding the method by which the longstanding grievance for the flood-affecte areas of Parappukara, etc., could be satisfactorily handled"

So, Sir, you will find that the Chief Engineer, with the help of the Irrigation Department, after making thorough investigations and after getting the report of the Special Engineer, did arrive at a definite scheme. So it is no argument to say that they had not sufficient technical knowledge or data when they accepted the Pallisseri diversion scheme and provided in the budget for over a lakh and odd of rupees. The attitude of the Government towards this measure has subsequently become step-motherly. Instead, another irrigation work is taken up. Question No. 22 (b) of to-day runs as follows:—"Has the Diwan received any petition, dated 7th Mithunam 1104, from the inhabitants of Irinjalakkuda and neighbouring villages pointing out the necessity of a canal by the side of the Irinjalakkuda market, and if so, what is it and what action is taken on the same?". The answer is: "Yes. It is for a canal by the side of Irinjalakkuda market connecting the Muriyad lake with Kakkathuruthi. An estimate for the same has been prepared. The

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

matter is being considered by the Government. Also it is proposed to take up the Karuvannur scheme after watching the effect of the diversion from the Muriyad lake which will be useful for navigation also." So the idea of the Government as expressed here is to take up the Kakkathuruthi scheme first. Then wait and watch its results and then decide whether the Karuvannur scheme should be taken up at all. Now, Sir, this Muriyad-Kakkathuruthi canal, I do not for a moment deny, is an important one. Both from a commercial and agricultural point of view it is a very desirable scheme. I dare say that it ought to be looked into. But I really cannot understand the logic of having made the flood-relief measure to wait and abide by the results of the Kakkathuruthi canal.

President.—The only point in connection with this is, if this Muriyad-Kakkathuruthi canal will drawn off a large quantity of water, then no Pallisseri diversion will be necessary. That is the alternative proposal.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—The waters in the Muriyad lake rise only after the Karuvannur river and areas the round about it are flooded and ruined. The Kakkathuruthi canal can only vacate the water which has come there by the floods. Our point is that the flood itself should be avoided. The Pallisseri scheme will be an effective measure to avoid the floods altogether, the excess water in the Karuvannur river being diverted otherwise.

President.—If facilities are given for the fee flow of water, then, you see, we will have no flood.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—So, instead of taking this scheme first, that is the Kakkathuruthi scheme, the scheme for the diversion of the Karuvannur river may be looked into first as it is the most important one and the most urgent one which requires earliest consideration. With a view that this work should be looked into in the year 1104 itself, they provided about a lakh of rupees for this work. But the whole amount lapsed without being utilised. Now they seem to have provided 5,000 rupees for such a big concern, just to show, I suppose, that they have not abandoned it altogether. They are giving it now a secondary consideration only, a very step-motherly attitude, I should say.

I am also authentically informed that about six Panchayat areas, seriously affected by these floods, jointly sent in resolutions to Government stating that the Pallisseri scheme was the most effective measure imaginable and praying it might be taken up at once. There are 21 villages injuriously affected by the floods. The Panchayats of the locality met together and jointly waited deputation on the Government to press for this extreme necessity according to them. There are, as I have already mentioned,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

acres of land which could be profitably cultivated if they were not exposed to the danger of the floods every year. The ruining of the poor, loss of their lives and the destruction of their houses could all be avoided if only the Government would take up in hand the Karuvannur diversion scheme. It is from a purely humanitarian point of view I urge for its acceptance.

Again, Sir, the Chief Engineer has well observed that one scheme *alone* would not work to solve the problem. The Chief Engineer has thus emphasised that more than one scheme will be necessary to effect this flood relief. If the Kakkathuruthi scheme is as important a flood-relief measure as the other one, then why not take up both the schemes at once? In 1104 this work was provided for. Why give it up now? I request the Government not to abandon a scheme to which they had already committed themselves. So, in the name of the flood-stricken poor people, I strongly urge that the scheme of opening out a canal from below the junction of the Karuvannur river may at once be taken up either alone by itself or along with the other scheme. Pray don't make it secondary to the Kakkathuruthi scheme.

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—Sir, I second the resolution. Before I proceed it will be worthwhile to make some observations on, or to give some glimpses of, the geographical situation of places, so that some Members who are not acquainted with the locality may get a correct idea "of the proposed scheme."

Now, the so-called Karuvannur river is the combination of two rivers, namely, the Kurumali river and the Manali river. The Manali river proceeds from the Trichur hills and the Kurumali river proceeds from the Palapilly hills. Both these rivers join at the junction called the Palakkadavu junction. From there it takes its course due west and in its course it branches out at Chirakkal emptying the water of that branch to the Trichur lake. Further it proceeds southwards in the course of which it empties its water by another branch to Pazhuvil and takes its course due west passing to Karanchira and then proceeding along Triprayar empties itself in the *Azhi*. This course of the river every Member would like to understand so as to clear difficulties and enable him to understand the true position of the locality. The Karuvannur river is practically a mischievous river. Reading the records we find that the utter injury committed by this river can be traced as far back as the year 1051. We find that the Government has been lavishly spending money for the maintenance of the Karuvannur bund. We do not know when this bund was put up, but we know, as a matter of fact, that much amount had been utilised for the erection of the bund.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—The bund was put up in 1818.

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—It has been the cause for the great loss and destruction for the last so many years.

President.—The erection of the bund?

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—It has obstructed the natural course of the water. It was inadvisable.

Now, this river is getting silted up every year by the torrential rush of waters from the hills by cutting deep ravines through the river, so much so that in this on-rush it is locating much silt on the ways, so much silt that at present these two rivers have become so narrow that it has not sufficient width for letting out its water in its ordinary course. When heavy rains fall this river cannot contain the normal flow of water and bursts out on the sides which are lowlying regions whose level is not different from the bed of the river. So it sends out its surplus water into the Muriyad lake. This Muriyad lake also receives water from the adjoining canals, chief of them being the Thommana Thodu. These are practically small streams which empty their waters into the Muriyad lake. Now, before the Karuvannur river empties its water into the Muriyad lake, it is already filled with the waters of the three other main *thodus* and has not the capacity to receive more water so that the level in the Karuvannur river rises very high. The flow of the surplus water in the Karuvannur river cannot find its way to the Muriyad lake and so it empties itself in different ways doing great injuries to the paddy fields and causing destruction to the life and property of His Highness' loyal subjects. The Muriyad lake comprises nearly 6,000 acres of land. The Karuvannur river and the Manali river take nearly 21 villages which are affected by these floods and the Karuvannur river which is the confluence of the above two rivers really causes destruction to other 20 villages lying on the borders of the Trichur lake. The catchment area probably of these two rivers covers nearly 45 villages which yield perhaps an average out-turn of more than 40 lakhs of *paras* of paddy, and also I must suggest that this catchment area of these two rivers comprises the Midlands of our State which are rich in soil, rich in plantation and wherefrom our Government derives its chief source of revenue. And also taking together the total population of these 40 or 45 villages I can assuredly confess in this House that it will take more than one-fifth of the total population of the State.

Now, having described the course of this river and also described the magnitude of the problem before us, I now proceed to inform the House the comparative merits and demerits of the Pallisseri and the Kakkathuruthi schemes. So far as I

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

have gathered and learned, the sides of the two rivers are low-lying plains and, therefore, the sides of these rivers are not protected properly. The surplus water in the river easily floods the adjoining plains and causes destruction at its will. Now, the proposed scheme—the Pallisseri scheme—proceeds from Palakkadavu, i. e., the combination of these two rivers, and takes its course due north-west so as to empty its waters into the Trichur lake. The Kakkathuruthi scheme proceeds from Pullur on the Thommana road and takes a long way of nearly 6 miles and empties itself to the Karupadanna back-waters These are the two schemes proposed by the Government and for which money has been provided in the budget and for which investigation has been conducted for the last two years, and the Chief Irrigation Officer has submitted his reports long ago. Now, I may tell you that so far no objection has come from the public condmning the Pallisseri diversion scheme whereas, as a matter of fact, I know that the Kakkathuruthi scheme has been condemned by certain sections of the people of the State.

Mr. V. D. Ouepnsh—Who are they?

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—There are several petitions pending with the Government. This scheme, even though I admit it is important from a commercial pioint of view, may not be so important as the Pallisseri diversion scheme which is the more urgent one from an agricultural stand-point and more beneficial to avert the ravages of floods. By the Pallisseri diversion the surplus water will be diverted to low level plains at a minimum cost. Whereas the Kakkathuruthi scheme takes its course through high lands and much money has to be spent for the diversion. The Pallisseri diversion is only helping the course of nature seeing that the bed-level of the river is on a par with the level of the fields whereas, when we trace the course of the Kakkathuruthi scheme, we find that the level, there, is much higher.

President.—We have not time. You can continue after lunch.

The House rose for lunch at 2 p. m. and met again at 3 p m. with the Deputy President in the Chair.

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—Somehow, there is an imprission in the minds of Hon'ble Members that I am opposed to the Kakkathuruthi scheme.o Far be it from my mind. I know it is of commercial importance and affords in some measure irrigatonal facilities and flood relief. But I press this point home that the Pallisseri scheme will be more feasible. Therefore, I impress upon this House that this matter may be taken up along with the Kakkathuruthi scheme since the matter is so very urgent. Now, one might ask what is the purpose of this resolution since

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

we find that Rs. 5,000 has been budgetted for that purpose That might be the possible objection raised on the other side. But, as I said, I support this resolution on the ground of policy and principle which the Government cannot avoid in the face of the commitments made in this Council and in the last Council. Times out of number they have said they have studied this problem, they have found the real solution and that the Chief Irrigational Officer has made investigations and submitted reports, and I believe that the reports were accepted by the Head of the Department. Having provided one lakh of rupees for the Manali and Kurumali diversion of the rivers, to provide Rs. 5,000 in the next budget, just to show to the House that they are not abandoning the scheme, and then at the same time to advance Rs. 30,000 for another scheme which was not in the minds of the public is opposed to the policy and is opposed to the commitment made in this House. I, therefore, support this resolution on the ground of principle, on the ground of its expediency also. The next moment the Government may turn down and say that, having investigated two or three schemes, the Amballur scheme, the Tanikudam scheme, all these schemes which were in the air, they may go to the Kakkathuruthi or Ochenthuruthi scheme. I only impress upon this House that you might take any scheme at your command. You may take any scheme which is effective and which is possible of affording relief and we are prepared to grant any amount you ask, even at the cost of fresh taxation. These schemes were in the air for so many years. It is the wayward, languishing and sluggish policy to put off schemes which were recognised by the public and by the Government that I take objection to here. That is what I condemn in this House. I, therefore, emphatically support the resolution as it stands, and in the meanwhile I tender my apology for the mistaken impression entertained by the Members of this Council on account of the observations made before. Now, if this scheme is taken up, it will, I think, give us a dawned hope since so many splendid houses receive great relief and we may avoid a recurrence of such disasters which were visiting the public at large. Considering the importance I don't grudge its cost. According to the estimate submitted by the Chief Engineer, the cost would come to one lakh and twenty thousand for the more emergent repairs. What must have been the cost of the construction of this bund in previous years? What possibly will be the disaster, the calamity, the misery, the loss sustained by the Government and by the public at large seeing that we are inflicted now and then by these disastrous floods? I appeal to the Members of this House in this connection, since it is a matter affecting the general public. I request the Govern-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ment not to hold aloof from the non-official opinion but join us in support of the cause of the poor, for the support of the agriculturists for the heralding of a better time to come for the people. I would request the Government in my humble way that they should not oppose in a solid phalanx and be indifferent to this resolution. The Government should be accessible to all moderate calls or demands made by the public and they should strongly support this resolution. I hope that the Kakkathuruthi scheme and also the Pallisseri scheme have been investigated. If the Government really intends to take adequate measures, all these schemes may be taken up so that it may afford irrigational facilities, it may serve commercial purposes also. One will be an effective flood remedy for this longstanding evil, the other a proper relief to commercial difficulties.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar :—I sent an amendment to this resolution which I don't see printed in the agenda.

Deputy President :—Only received yesterday: You can't expect in the agenda.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Wariar.—It appears it was received late. I may be allowed to move.

Deputy President.—Yes, you may move.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.—My amendment to this resolution runs thus; "To omit all the words after the word 'water' and add the following: "by opening a navigable canal from the Manali river *via* Ollur-Kanimangalam to meet the Trichur-Karanchira canal." This amendment is in fact my resolution which I have tabled and which in the ballot has come as resolution 47. But being an allied subject, and also on account of the fact that this resolution, as I thought, does not specify any particular scheme of diversion, I thought it advisable to move my resolution as an amendment to this resolution. The resolution as amended will run thus. That in view of the great sufferings caused by successive floods from the Manali and Kurumali rivers, this house recommends to the Government to take up at once the scheme of the diversion of water by opening a navigable canal from the Manali river *via* Ollur—Kanimangalam to meet the Trichur—Karanchira canal".

Now, from the speech of the Hon'ble Member, I understand that he has a definite scheme in view, and that is what is familiarly known as the Pallisseri scheme. My amendment relates to another scheme which may be called Manali diversion scheme or, as the Chief Engineer has called it, the Marathakara scheme. I do not claim to be an expert in these matters, but I wish to bring to the notice of the Government the importance of this amendment and then leave the matter there. Now after my speech there will be three schemes, the Kakkathuruthi scheme, the Pallisseri scheme and the Marathakara scheme. The main

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

object of this resolution is to give relief to the flood, and it has been admitted by both, Hon'ble Members and the Government, that it is a very serious problem. It was being investigated from time to time and no definite, satisfactory settlement has come up to yet. From what has transpired in this Council and in the last it would appear that the Government is adopting a policy of vascillation.

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—Is my friend moving the resolution

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.—It appears that the Government is changing from one scheme to another, I thought last year that this Marathakara scheme will be an accomplished fact within a few months, and it has been practically promised also. All the investigations were over, and I don't think anything was said against that scheme. Now, in answer to question No. 22 it appears, after the floods of 1104, they think it necessary to revise these two schemes. I thought that would be an opportunity for them to take up this scheme at once and work it up instead of spending more time for a scheme that has been already investigated and I understand even the estimates prepared.

The advantages claimed for my scheme I shall place before you categorically. I don't wish to tread upon the grounds that have been covered by my previous speakers.

The flood is caused by the two rivers and the scheme that I suggest is that the water from the one river, that is Manali river, may be diverted, say, just about two miles above Palakkadavu where the two rivers meet. My point is that it will relieve the pressure or the congestion at that place at Palakkadavu; it will also have the advantage of removing the flood from the five or six villages between the junctions of these two rivers, Palakkadavu, Marathakara, Amballur, Trikkur and venmanikkara, After the flood in these areas the water goes into Palakkadavu.

The other advantage that I claim for my scheme is that there is already a canal, a *thodu* there, Padavara *thodu*, which has only to be widened. The acquisition charges and other things will be cheaper.

Then it goes through hard soil and there is not any fear or apprehension of any breach. On the other hand, there may be the possibility of danger, if the Pallisseri scheme is carried out. The canal will have to go through a portion of the Arrattupuzha *padom* which has to be protected by bunds on the southern side like the bunds we obtain on the other side. I am sure the level of the water will be much higher than the water in the *paaom*. So there will be chances of breach which can be prevented if this scheme is accepted.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

I claim some other advantage also for this, the commercial aspect of this. Ollur, as you are aware, is growing in importance and there are about 15 or 16 tile factories already in existence doing good work, four or five rice mills, and if the canal also be diverted, it can be used for traffic. They can get timber and firewood and they can send their commodities, tiles and other things, to Ernakulam, etc., by water. It will be very cheaper.

In addition to that it will also supply the wants. It can be used to meet the scarcities of water during the summer. If the Manali river is diverted, it will discharge itself into the sea at least one day earlier, at least ten or twelve hours. I am subject to correction. I think the distance is very small. If the water of the Manali river is diverted at this place, the distance from that place to the Enammakkal bund and the distance it will have to go if it has to go through the Palakkal *thodu* and other places will be lessened by at least ten miles. So, from all these points, I think the Government had also appreciated all these facts and they were ready to take up the scheme, I don't know why they gave it up. Whatever that be, my point is, I am submitting at this stage that I am not opposing the other resolution. It may be treated as part of the original resolution itself. I have no objection if the Government takes up both these schemes together. Anyway I would only impress upon the Government the fact that it is absolutely necessary that they should take up this scheme at once instead of wasting time and revising. It is better they do something. Never mind if they take up one scheme and it fails. No matter considering its importance. That is all what they will lose. The country will have the satisfaction that the Government at least is trying to do its best. No man is infallible. If any scheme fails, it does not matter so far as the people are concerned. So far, the Government have been giving us assurances that they will see to it. There have been this lip sympathy. There has been no tangible solution or tackling of this problem. I, therefore, request the Government that they should take up the scheme immediately.

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. എ. രാമചന്ദ്രയ്യർ.—ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു.

Deputy President.—Are you supporting the amendment?

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Original resolution.

Deputy President.—Does anybody support the amendment?

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—If the amendment is not seconded, it will be lost.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—I beg to second that amendment just to have a discussion on the subject. The amendment should

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

not go. We must hear all about the three schemes, four schemes or any number of schemes. I thought there would be somebody to second.

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. എ. രാമചന്ദ്രയ്യർ.—ഇന്നു ഇവിടെ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള പ്രമേയം എന്താണെന്നു ആദ്യമായി ആലോചിക്കാം. ഇതിൽ കൊച്ചിരാജ്യത്തിലെ ഉദ്ദേശം ലക്ഷത്തി അമ്പതിനായിരം കുഞ്ഞുകുട്ടി പരാധീനങ്ങളുടെ ദേഹരക്ഷ, ജീവരക്ഷ, വീടുരക്ഷ, കൃഷിരക്ഷ ഇതുകൾ ചെയ്യുന്നതിനാണെന്നാണ് അപേക്ഷിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളത്. ഇതിനെക്കാൾ അധികം പ്രധാനമായ ഒരു പ്രമേയം ഈ വിടെ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നതിനു സംശയമാണ്. കാക്കത്തുരുത്തി സ്കീമാണെങ്കിൽ ഒരു കുഞ്ഞുസ്കീം ഉപയുക്തമായിരിക്കാം. എന്നാൽ ഇവിടെ ജീവരക്ഷയാണ് പ്രധാനം. വളരെക്കാലമായി മലവെള്ളത്തിൽ വീടുകളൊലിച്ചുപോകയും മരണം സംഭവിക്കയും ചെയ്യുന്നതിനു. ഈ സങ്കടം തീർത്തുതരുന്നതിനാണ് അപേക്ഷ. ഒരാൾക്കു ഒരു വീടുകൾ നന്നാക്കുന്നതിനു പണം കൊടുത്തു എന്നു പറയുന്നതു ഈ സ്ഥലത്താണ്. ഇതു നടപ്പിൽ വന്നാൽ നിശ്ചയമായും കൊച്ചിരാജ്യത്തിന്റെ എട്ടിൽ ഒരുഭാഗത്തിനു രക്ഷകിട്ടും. കഴിഞ്ഞതവണയുള്ള അനവധിജനങ്ങൾ ഗവർമെണ്ടിലേക്കു വർണ്ണിച്ചെഴുതി അയച്ചു എന്നോ പഞ്ചായത്തുകൾ യോഗംകൂടി റെസല്യൂഷൻ പാസ്സാക്കി ഗവർമെണ്ടിലേക്കു സമർപ്പിച്ചു. ദിവാൻജി അവർകളുടെയും ചീഫ് എഞ്ചിനീയരുടെയും മുമ്പിൽ ഡെപ്യൂട്ടേഷൻപോയി വിവരങ്ങളറിയിച്ചു. വർത്തമാനപത്രങ്ങളിൽ ലേഖനങ്ങൾ പ്രസിദ്ധപ്പെടുത്തി. ജനങ്ങളുടെ സങ്കടങ്ങളെ വിദിതമാക്കി. ഇതൊന്നും എല്ലാം ഫലമായി ഒരു നേഷണംനടത്തി ഉടനെ വേണ്ടതു ചെയ്യുന്നതാണെന്നു വാഗ്ദാനവുംചെയ്തു. അതിനു ബഡ്ജറ്റിൽ ഒരു പ്രൊവിഷനും വെച്ചു. ഇതിനെല്ലാം ശേഷം ഞങ്ങൾ വേറെ ഒരു സ്കീം കണ്ടുപിടിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു. അതുകഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടു ഇതു എന്നു പറയുന്നതിനു എന്താണർത്ഥം? ഒരു കൊല്ലം അപ്പുറവന്നു ഒരുനേഷണം നടത്തി, വാഗ്ദാനവുംചെയ്തു. പിന്നത്തെകൊല്ലവും അങ്ങിനെതന്നെ. ഇപ്രകാരമുള്ള അനേഷണവും വാഗ്ദാനവും അപേക്ഷയായിട്ടുകണ്ടാൽ മതിയൊ? വാഗ്ദാനം ശരിയായി നടത്തണ്ടെ? ഇതിനെപ്പറ്റി ഒരിക്കലല്ല, പലതവണയും ഈ കൌൺസിലിൽ പ്രസ്താവിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു. ഇതിനെല്ലാംഅർത്ഥമെന്തു? ആയതുകൊണ്ടു ഇതുകഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടില്ലാതെ വേറെ ഒരു സ്കീം എടുക്കരുതെന്നാണ് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം. അതിനാൽ ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ ബലമായി പിന്താങ്ങുന്നു.

Mr. V. V. Anantapadmanabha Ayyar.—I should like to support this resolution. I am not possessed of any of the details with respect to any of the particular schemes set out before this House by the Hon'ble Members who spoke before me. Nor

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

would I be able to definitely point out before this House as to which scheme ought to be preferred because I am not possessed of any expert knowledge in respect of this matter. But what I should like to point out to the Government in this matter is that it is time for the Government to change its policy of scheming always and to try hereafter at least to put into execution some of these schemes. Several schemes there have been, investigations have taken place, reports have been submitted to the Government and orders have been passed thereon. But soon after, every one of these schemes is shelved and no work is taken up on that; and in spite of all these schemes and orders by the Government, the floods continue unabated, and year after year they are devastating a large area of land, working so much havoc to the people. It is time for us to realise that something ought to be done. Budgeting a large amount for purposes of irrigation, for the purpose of giving effect to these schemes and allowing all the amounts to lapse without any work being turned out has been the order of the day. If we are going to continue like that, I don't know where we are going to stop. The reason is that we find that nobody is in charge of this particular Department, there is nobody responsiblef or the delay in these matters. Well, there is the Government responsible but there is no particular officer responsible for the delay in carrying out the irrigation works.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—That does not matter much.

Mr. V. V. Anantapadmanabha Ayyar.—The Revenue Member would say that the Member for Public Works is in charge of irrigation works. Some works of irrigation are in charge of the Member for Public Works, some in charge of the Revenue Member and some others under the Panchayat Superintendent. Nobody is in particular charge of the irrigation works. The Government does not absolve itself of its responsibility by simply making investigations and making schemes for the purpose. Some particular scheme has to be investigated and decided upon and immediately put to action. Therefore, I support the resolution.

Mr. V. D. Ouseph.—Before I oppose or support the resolution, I want some information from the Member for Engineering. How far has the Kakkathuruthi scheme progressed? Has it been taken up?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—It is pending before the Government.

Mr. V. D. Ouseph.—For sanction? May I know from the mover of the resolution whether he means that the Kakkathuruthi scheme should be suspended?

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—I made it perfectly clear.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. V. D. Ouseph.—I want to make his position clear before I oppose or support. I should like to know from the mover of the resolution whether he wants to give preference to his scheme.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—I will make it clear. I said that primary importance should be given to my scheme and only secondary importance to the other. If Kakkathuruthi scheme is made a substitute, I shall certainly oppose it. If Kakkathuruthi scheme is taken up and also the other, it does not matter.

Mr. T. M. Krishna Menon.—If both cannot be taken up, yours may be taken up first.

Mr. V. D. Ouseph.—Is it only one of the two schemes to be worked out? If not, the question does not arise.

Deputy President.—Both the schemes will be taken up or only one?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—I think it is better for me to treat with this subject along with my observations. I am not able to answer in a piece-meal fashion.

Deputy President.—He wants to know whether you are going to take up both the schemes together.

Mr. V. D. Ouseph.—Has this one any connection with the other?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—Muriyad scheme is independent. It has no connection with this and has gone for Government sanction.

Mr. V. D. Ouseph.—I shall reserve my speech and await the answer of the Government.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—What would be the effect on the *kole* cultivation by this diversion? Will there be any effect upon the *kole* cultivation?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—By which diversion?

Dr. A. G. Menon.—Pallisseri. Whether there will be any bad effect upon the *kole* cultivation?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—There will not be any bad effect at all. You can hardly expect me to answer that now. I shall make it clear in my speech.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Will you be in a position to tell us which scheme would cost us more, the Pallisseri or the Kakkathuruthi?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—It is not a question of cost.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Will you be able to tell us, laymen, which would cost more? If it is possible, we would be able to make some observations on that also.

Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.—But he must make his own observations.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—Sir, in rising to address this House I labour under two or three physical disabilities. One is the very patent one of my voice being hoarse and another disability, many of you know, I am subject to, and the third is I am new to this Council. I am not accustomed to the traditions and the rules of debate. So, if there is anything wanting in what I say, I hope the Hon'ble Members will bear with me. (*Hear, hear.*) I shall try to speak as loud as I can.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—You can speak as well in spite of your physical disabilities.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—The Hon'ble Member for Anthikad gave in a few words the idea of the geography of the river and his account is correct. I wanted to give an idea of the geography of the river. Since he has given it, I do not think it necessary to travel over the same ground. As he said, it is a river formed by the confluence of the two rivers, Manali and Kurumali. These two rivers join at Palakkadavu, a mile or two to the east of Urakam. After going some distance to the west, it branches off at Karanchira. One branch goes north and joins the sea at Chettuvai. Another branch joins the sea at Cranganur. On both sides of the river, on the northern side and on the southern side of it, there are two big lakes, one called the Enammakkal lake and the other called the Muriyad lake. When the level of the water in the Karuvannur river rises very high, it goes to the Enamakkal lake basin in the north and the Muriyad basin in the south. These two basins act as flood moderators. By flood moderators, I think Hon'ble Members can understand me. If it were not for these two big reservoirs, all the water will confine itself to the Karuvannur river and it will work havoc and damage on the bank of the Karuvannur river. So when a good lot of water escapes into these two basins, the water in the river is proportionately reduced. These two lakes act and serve as flood moderators. Their presence is providential and of course a great help to the low lying lands and houses on both sides of the river. This aspect of the matter must be thoroughly understood before dealing with the Karuvannur floods.

After having emphasised the importance of the Enammakkal lake and the Muriyad lake, I shall give in a few words the history of the scheme. As the Hon'ble Member for Jenmi constituency said, the present Karuvannur bund was put up about 1818. At that time engineering knowledge had not advanced to the state it has advanced now. At that time people thought the best way was to put flood banks. That is of course what strikes everybody *prima facie*. Here is a good deal of water. It works mischief. So the best thing is to confine it. By putting flood

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

banks the water is confined in the river. That was the argument of the people in those days. So flood banks were put and, as many of you know, we have been reaping the evils of that unwise action. I don't say it was unwise, that was all that the people knew in those days. We know better. We have been spending lakhs, (that is no exaggeration) upon maintaining and keeping the bund which ought not to have been there at all.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—Why don't you remove it now ?

Mr. M.D.Narayana Ayyar.—I will come to that now. So on account of this there have been two evil consequences in the Karuvannur river.One is gradual silting up, I think the Member for Anthikad gave expression to that view, the gradual silting up of the bed of the Karuvannur river. It is silting up gradually and it is a few feet higher than before the bund was put up.This is one of the evil effects of the bund system. In many parts of the world these bunds are removed. Another evil effect. During the ordinary floods the flood water is confined within the river and the bund serves the purpose. During abnormal floods water bursts through the weakest point. It is not possible to maintain the bund on the same degree of strength for ten or twelve miles. It is not always possible to keep up the bund on the same degree of strength. Water in the river rises up considerably. It finds out weak points and bursts through the bund and the result is low-lying lands, houses, and everything are carried before the inrushing flood. It is this in-rush of water that is responsible for more damages than actual submersion: Members will understand that submersion will not affect either the produce or the fertility of the land in any way. It is only this in-rush of water, that water rushing through a particular place carrying everything before it, that causes damages more than ordinary submersion by flood water. Ordinary submersion of flood water, we cannot remedy. We do not know why Providence sends more rain every ten or fifteen years. More rain comes, more water comes in the rivers. This will not do any mischief at all. It is only in this Karuvannur river this damage is heard. Bunds were put long ago and we are reaping the fruits of this now.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—Why not remove the bund ?

Mr.M.D.Narayana Ayyar.—I will come to that. So much for the present state of affairs. I shall give you in a few words what we did and what we are going to do. During the days of Mr.Browning,Chief Engineer, this question was investigated by him on many occasions. A staff was appointed and the question was investigated at great length. The Special Engineer

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

who was appointed at that time reported that the Muriyad scheme about which so much has been heard to-day is the best scheme. The idea was to divert the water of the Karuvannur river to Muriyad. If some means were found whereby this surplus water in the Muriyad lake is removed to sea sooner, a solution can be found for this flood. The idea is that the Karuvannur river brings in more water than it can contain. If by some way we can remove this water to the sea sooner, that itself will improve matters considerably. That is the thing that we want to do. We want to take off a portion of the water from the Karuvannur river and send it by some quicker way to the sea. So when the surplus water in the Muriyad lake is removed to the sea by another route than the river, more and more water from the Karuvannur river will flow into the Muriyad lake and more and more water from the Kakkathuruthi to the sea. It, therefore, follows that more and more water will flow into the sea *via* Muriyad and the Kakkathuruthi canal. That is what we want to do. Instead of Karuvannur water going through Karanchira, a portion of the water is taken away and let into the sea, and soon the problem is solved. That is what was investigated and found when Mr. Browning was the Chief Engineer.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—Has he made any actual measurement of the volume of water?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—The papers are not with me. I am unable to say. I know it was investigated by a highly paid staff and I must presume that the investigation of the highly paid staff was scientific and correct.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—Figures?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—Figures are not with me. I have got the figures now which have been arrived at by the present staff.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—Was all this discovery available to the present Chief Engineer when he said that the Pallisseri scheme should be taken up?

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Is that not a different scheme from the Kakkathuruthi scheme?

Mr. M.D. Narayana Ayyar.—It is practically the same. There may be differences in detail. The main outlines are the same to divert the water from Muriyad.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—The places may be different.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—I do not want to be interrupted.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—We don't want to interrupt you, Sir, but we want the details.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—That was the state of affairs when Mr. Browning left the Department. Then Mr. Krish-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

nan Nayar came. He had two views. One was that putting up the bund in the Karuvannur river was a mistake. That of course everybody has agreed. His other view was to divert the flow of water in the river otherwise than along the same river was injurious. If you divert from the Karuvannur river, then we are injuring somebody else. So this diversion is not the proper way. If the bund could have been removed, it would have been the best thing. That may also be a good remedy, but there were vested interests to be taken into consideration. Many people had built houses beside the bund and had grown good gardens. At one stroke of the pen we cannot remove the bund since the people have made costly improvements there. So Mr. Krishnan Nayar would not do anything. When the present permanent Chief Engineer took charge, he investigated the whole matter and he found that there were three schemes which could be considered. One is what is called the Manali scheme and the other the Pallisseri scheme and the third the Muriyad scheme. The Manali scheme is to cut a canal from the Manali river 3 or 4 miles away from the Kurumali at a place called Edakkunni and it takes this water *via* Ollur to the Enamakkal lake. That is the Manali scheme. By the second scheme the water was to be taken to the Enamakkal lake through a new canal to be cut a little above or below, I am not exactly sure, the junction of the river Manali with the Kurumali river. Then there is the Muriyad scheme about which I have already spoken. While these 3 schemes were being investigated, we were simultaneously taking another scheme which, though not a flood remedy, subsequently proved to be an effective remedy. I do not know whether many of you have seen the Enamavu weir. It is a masonry bund to regulate the outflow of the water from the Enamavu lake to the river going to Chettuvai. It is about 220 ft. wide. In 1100 we widened this weir to double the original width. Therefore, now, double the quanity of water flows from the Enamakkal lake and from there to Chettuvai. By this widening of the Enamavu dam we have substantially reduced the flood level. That means more water can go from the Karuvannur river and join at Chettuvai. So, by this widening of the Enamavu dam we have substantially reduced the quantity of flood coming down the Karuvannur river.

After this work was carried out in 1100 we have got records to show that the damages due to floods have been considerably reduced and I think the Hon'ble the Revenue Member will bear testimony to it.

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—What about last year?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—I do not say absolutely they have been reduced but I say that it is far less than what it

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

was before 1100. There has been of course submerging of crops. Now I will come to the floods of last year. Last year's crops were very splendid and the fields improved by a few days of submersion. Last year's out-turn was also splendid.

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—Several well-known authorities have spoken otherwise.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Has the Revenue Member recommended any remission of taxation?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—We have substantially reduced the effect of floods by widening the Enamakkal weir. There is a bridge on the canal taking from the Karuvannur to Enamakkal. The surplus water goes through this. This Chirakal canal was only 26 ft. wide. In 1099 the bridge collapsed and we took the opportunity in the course of the reconstruction to widen it from 26 ft. to 50 ft. Now more water flows into the Enamakkal dam through this Chirakkal canal on account of this widening. By the widening of the Chirakkal canal and the Enamakkal weir we have substantially reduced the flood in the Karuvannur river and the effect is beneficial. I do not think that any official records will prove to the contrary. Then as regards last year's floods. Last year's floods also support me. The damage to crops occurred only in places where the bund was breached. I know in Arattupuzha these crops were submerged. After the floods the crops have grown much more splendidly than before the submersion. The only damage that was caused was to the places where the bund was breached. As I have said, we have done these two things and we do not wish to rest content by these two works. We are perfectly aware that something more must be done. We are now concentrating our attention on these three schemes and we have also prepared estimates and plans. My information about the Manali scheme is that there were protests in this Council, that many motions were tabled for postponing or abandoning that work.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.—You were misinformed. I can assure the Hon'ble Member that there was absolutely no opposition either in this Council or outside. One or two landowners only protested against this scheme. They subsequently accepted the same with some slight modification.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—I know as a matter of fact that there were petitions against this scheme. We are prepared to adopt the Manali scheme.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—You are the person who should advise us on this matter.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—The Pallisseri scheme is not promising. We had money provided for the same in the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

budget of 1104. A mistake was found out subsequently, and it was a piece of extreme good fortune that the work was delayed. In fact we were standing upon a precipice and according to the promise made in this House we would have started the work. But then the damages to the crops would be very serious for having started a scheme of this nature.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—What was the trouble, please ?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—The trouble was due to a flaw in the collection of the data. The canal was to run on a five feet cutting. I will now say a few words about the essential characteristics of a diversion canal. There are three conditions to be satisfied for a diversion canal. It must run along hard ground. Otherwise it will become wider and wider year by year by erosion and will encroach upon wet lands and work mischief and so it must run through hard ground. Then there must be sufficient velocity to take off the water quickly. Otherwise water will stagnate and cause mischief. A diversion canal should run only in cutting, i. e., the entire depth of the canal should be below the surface of the ground on either side along which the canal runs. It will not do for a diversion canal to have its water level above the field level. If the diversion is taken on embankments we will have to put up costly bunds on either side. As I have already said concerning the embankments on the Karuvannur river, we already know, what evils we will be put to. So a repetition of this kind will happen. If a diversion canal is taken in an embankment, the same difficulties will arise, for in the last year's abnormal floods the bunds on both sides were washed off, and it will be eroded and destroyed. If we had taken up the Pallisseri scheme, the effects would have been that the entire fields in Arattupuzha would have been eroded and there would not have been a square foot of field worth cultivating this year, and in fact it was providential that we did not do the work this year.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—Was it not known to the Department earlier? I would like to know from the Hon'ble Member how this escaped the attention of the Department.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—When we were doing simultaneously all these three schemes, we forgot to take into account the good effects occasioned by the widening of the Enamakkal weir. It is a mistake which is but natural. We only took the ordinary normal state of affairs when taking the levels for the Pallisseri scheme. At any rate this mistake was due to our ignoring, not wilful ignoring, of circumstances. It was a piece of oversight.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—Or ignorance.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. A. B. Salem.—May we know the name of the officer who investigated the scheme ?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—I do not know. The good effects of the Enamakkal weir were only patent after a year or two. So we could not adjust the level. On account of that the trouble arose. Subsequently it was found that the Pallisseri scheme would be entirely unsuccessful since the water level would be higher than the field level. I would like to know whether any Hon'ble Member of this House would give his approval to the diversion of the canal when its water level is higher than the field level. Last year there was sudden rush of water from eight to ten feet.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—We are not attributing any blame to the Chief Engineer.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—It is not a blunder at all.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I want to know the facts.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—On a point of information. The height of the water was reduced to five feet only. Then how will it affect the underground?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—I shall try to explain. Now there are two channels, one connected by a cross channel. These two channels are at the same height. At first if you depress the channel, one channel a little bit, then water will flow to a slight extent. Then the flow will be more and more quickly. As you go on lowering more water will flow.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—But you only lower the upper portion.

(Several Members stood up and spoke and nothing was audible.)

Mr. T. K. Krishna Menon.—We cannot issue an illustrated Proceedings.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—It is not to cross-examine the Hon'ble Member that we ask all these things. It is only just to understand. This is a very big problem. We must vote either way and we must understand either way.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—Only for information. We don't want long speeches. We want matters of fact.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—We have to give a certain width. We gave more width than would be necessary for the Pallisseri scheme, more than it was actually necessary before the widening. Now actually after the Enamakkal weir was widened so much fall is not necessary. The canal should not be deeper. After the widening of the Enamakkal weir there was not so much necessity to discharge so much water. I think

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

it is quite clear. I am unable to make it more clear. In some places the water rises from 5 to six feet above the field level and the whole place will then be eroded. So it is impossible for the Government to accord sanction for this Pallisseri scheme. It will be a very serious disaster for Hon'ble Members themselves to vote for this scheme. Now the scheme which is open to the Government is only the Marathakara scheme and the Government are prepared to take up that scheme.

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—For what purpose? It is lowered for discharging the excess of water. It has nothing to do with the Pallisseri scheme. Were these schemes undertaken just to lower the level of the water in the Trichur lake? I want to know whether these works were undertaken in furtherance of the diversion scheme so that the level of the water in the Trichur lake may be lowered.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—It has lowered now. I should like to know what inference the Hon'ble Member is going to draw from what I have said.

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—Was the lowering in furtherance of the Pallisseri scheme?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—I emphatically say no.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—When there is an engineering difficulty we would be the last person to say that the scheme should be proceeded with. We are not cross-examining you but only asking for information.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—May I ask one question, Sir? Can you give us some relief by way of another scheme?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—The Marathakara scheme will give more benefit.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Are you absolutely sure? We must have some scheme about which you are absolutely sure.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—In fact there is a resolution lower down, resolution No. 47. The same has been moved by Mr. Ikkanda Warriar as an amendment to this resolution.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—On a point of information. May I know whether this will affect the Muriyad, Enamakkal or Chirakkal lake?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—I do not say so.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja—With regard to the mistake I do not really understand. Here you have got the first scheme. The water from the Karuvannur river flows into the Trichur lake through the Palakkadavu diversion. Why should the level be raised?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—Now suppose there are four thousand cusecs of water. After the lowering of the Enamakkal dam on account of the flow from the lake these two

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

thousand cusecs flows by two ways. These figures are only for illustration. Water has to be taken. There was absolutely no idea of diverting the whole river or even half of it.

Mr. V. D. Ouseph.—Nobody said that.

Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.—So you are all agreed on that point!

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—When the water of the lake is out, it can be made more steep.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—It is very necessary to make everything plain. We are just like a Board of Directors. Expert knowledge must be conveyed to us in an intelligible, clear and concise manner. We are all labouring to understand what has been said by the Hon'ble Member. Without understanding the merits and demerits of all the respective schemes, how can we vote for one or the other? I have been sitting here without speaking one word and was trying to understand everything. Therefore ,it is necessary to make us understand what that mistake is. Everyone is fallible. In this work, if a mistake has been committed, it is for the Government to say how that mistake arose and for what reasons the work had to be given up.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—It was decided last year to undertake a certain work. Government had promised to undertake that work. Preliminary investigations have been made and money allotted. Afterwards Government comes forward with an alternative scheme and we are asked to accept that in its place. We want to know its reasons, why the original scheme was given up and why the new scheme was taken up. The gentleman who raised the question I can understand. I do not think that Government have any such policy. Therefore, I do not know why a certain scheme was dropped. And I can understand the difficulty that that gentleman feels.

Deputy President.—That would have been a legitimate question in the Budget Session.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—No, Sir. The question is, are we to support him or not. And in order that we may vote sensibly and intelligently, we want to know whether the Government's position is correct or the Government's position is wrong. It has been shown four officers giving four different schemes. Therefore, the Engineer is fallible. We want to know are we going to commit their mistakes?

Deputy President.—He has tried to the best of his ability to explain.

Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.—We were talking of what is the way of reviewing a certain thing. The miscalculation was

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

due to a new factor that came into existence. When the original estimate was framed that new factor was non-existent and that new factor took a long time to come to completion. When the completion process was accomplished, the data had altogether to be revised. The new factor is the widening of the weir. There is this amount of outlet for a fresh quantity of water. You double that outlet. It is not the level going down.

Dr. A. R. Menon.— I am afraid the Director with his poor technical knowledge is misinforming the House.

Mr. M. A. Chakko.—The difficulty we are labouring under is because the weir of the Enamakkal bund was widened, water level went up. Immediately we laymen will think that the ground level has gone up. That is when water level goes down the ground level goes up. We are under that mistake. We see the ebb and low tide here.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—I may be allowed to finish my observations, Sir. As regards the discussion now, I want to emphasise one aspect of the matter. I have tried my best to explain how, by lowering down and the widening of the Enamakkal weir the canal had to be taken onembankment And I confess my inability to add anything more to what I have said. There is another aspect. This Council, of course, is only the advisers of the Government and you are clearly only to dictate general lines of policy. You may come and say that the Karuvannur floods are disastrous and that something to remedy that may be done. But it won't do for a Legislative Council to come and say that you must do it in a particular fashion. Of course I am a believer in democracy myself. I would like to ask the Hon'ble Members whether they will, on going to the General Hospital, ask a Surgeon or a physician there to do an operation in a particular way or to prescribe a particular medicine.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—If we are not satisfied, we will.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—You level a charge against us whether it is within the purview of the Legislative Council to dictate. It is none of your business. We are asking you because Engineers are making mistakes. In 1818 his predecessors were fools and making mistakes. I put it in a more blunt way. I say with your knowledge are you sure you are not making mistakes. They made a mistake last year. This year they made a mistake. Then what is the trouble? What is the use of saying democracy? We don't want that sort of thing. We make allowance. You are interfering with our work. We are absolute fools so far as your Department is concerned and we don't want to interfere with your Department. We have got our own views in the matter. We want to know why you are challenging and it is a technical thing. What is the policy underlying it?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—I am sorry if I have conveyed any bad impression upon the subject.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—He says it is all an engineering mistake. If the Government admits, what is there? It is a mistake committed by them. We must change. There is no use of questioning or going into the policy. We never asked anything about your work. But you admit point-blank that it is a mistake and you cannot carry out the work you have done, and we should accede.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—I am sorry the scheme had to be dropped. I have not finished. I have something more.

Now I have said about the Manali scheme and Pallisseri scheme and last about the Muriyad scheme otherwise known as the Kakkathuruthi scheme. In a typed memorandum circulated by the Members of this House supporting the Member for Chalakkudi, it is said that it is not at all satisfactory. It starts from 4½ miles away from the river and all that. Now it is not a question of from how many miles the diversion canal starts. It does not matter if it starts 4½ miles away from the river. All that we want is out of the flood water from the Karuvannur river, as I said in the beginning of my speech, more and more water from the Karuvannur should flow out of it so that the flood level will fall. So the Muriyad scheme will substantially reduce the flood water because, as we see, more and more water will flow from the river to the Muriyad lake.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—The river itself is shallow. On either side of the river it will overflow. What about the interim course

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—If the flood level of the Karuvannur river is to be lowered, there will have to be more water pouring into the Muriyad lake.

Mr. I. E. Ambooken.—Have you taken the levels of the Muriyad lake and Trichur lake, the bottom level, I mean?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—I am unable to give you exactly.

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—May I know whether the very same principle will not apply in the other case also? If the level of the water is lowered by cutting out a canal to the Muriyad lake and emptying the water in the river into it, will the same principle apply to the other case also?

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—In which case, please?

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—The diversion of the Pallisseri to the Trichur lake.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—I have already said that the Pallisseri scheme is condemned for other reasons. An embankment will be necessary for holding the water in the canal.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—The level of the canal will have to be raised.

Mr. C. V. Kuriyan.—The level of the canal need not be raised if that canal is intended to divert the water to relieve the flood.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I wish to say a few words in this matter, Sir.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—No. I have not finished. The other two schemes are merely flood diversion schemes. This Muriyad scheme combines in itself another advantage also. And that is it is also useful for navigation. These canals are useful for only a few days in the year. We spend a lakh of rupees in the Karuvannur floods to divert a portion of the flood water. So this diversion is only useful during a few months of the year, Mithunam or Karkadagam. It does not contain water for many months of the year. So, in the Pallisseri and Marathakkara or Manali scheme, the canal will serve the purposes only for a few days, whereas in the Muriyad it will be useful for the entire twelve months of the year. The Kunnamkulam Member will appreciate the importance of a canal for commercial purposes, if there was one up to Kunnamkulam.

Mr. K. T. Mathew.—A little unwillingness on the part of the Government.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—On the part of the British Government.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—Nobody in this House disputes the commercial importance of it.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—The Muriyad scheme has the advantages of a flood diversion canal and also the advantages of a navigation canal. It is useful in two ways. I don't say it will be a very effective remedy for the floods. We are prepared to take both the Kakkathuruthi scheme and the Manali scheme. There is the allotment of Rs. 5,000 ready this year. Plans and estimates are ready. If the House approves of that work, we are prepared to take it up this year. And also there ia provision for the Kakkathuruthi scheme this year. The Chief Engineer has stated here that there will be two works taken up. I think this was emphasised by some Members. The Pallisseri scheme we cannot take up for the reasons that I have already tried to explain.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—On a point of information, is the level of the Muriyad lake rising as it proceeds to the east?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

It flows now to the west. You want to make it flow to the east.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—Ground level or water level you mean ?

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Water now flows to the west and you want to make it flow to the east.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—Before resuming my seat I want to emphasise on three or four points. One is we have not been apathetic in this matter. We have spent lakhs and lakhs in the misguided schemes in the past. As soon as we have found out that they are wrong, we set about investigating correct schemes and even now you cannot say that we have done nothing but scheming as the Member for Nellayi said. We had the Chirakkal bridge widening and the Enamakkal weir widening. These have told appreciably on the flood situation. Now it is only submersion for a few days that occurs. No serious damage on account of these two works. So much for what we have done. We have investigated 3 schemes of which one is absolutely unworkable. We have two schemes which we have to go on with your leave. If, during the course of my observations, I have offended any Member, I must beg to be excused. As this is the first time I have to speak in the Council and on account of my physical troubles I request you will bear with me and overlook the shortcomings I have committed.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I wish to say a few words. After hearing the elaborate discussion, one thing is striking my mind. My mind is entirely that of a layman. I do not happen to belong to any of the places, either to Irinjalakkuda, Pallisseri or Manali. I come from 40 miles away from them. So that I wish to claim unprejudiced views in the matter. One thing comes clear from this discussion. The Government has had few schemes, but did not act. We find that this trouble was created by the Government so long ago as 1818 b, putting up a wrong bund. The Government or its expert advisers seem to have gone out of their way to create trouble for the inhabitants of these 21 villages. It is, hence, no more a question of option on the part of the Government but a clear duty.

Mr. M. D. Narayana Ayyar.—There is no question at all. It was the state of knowledge in those days. There was no idea at all.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—The Hon'ble Member for Engineering need not misunderstand me. I am not attributing motives. I say that the low condition of knowledge at that time did this mischief. But the trouble is this low condition of knowledge appears to persist even now. Here I have got what appears to be a very clear and unequivocal statement, in this

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

report, that the Government resolved to cut a canal. I am sure unless the learned Chief Engineer stands up and says this is a mistake, I won't accept it. With such a serious document before us, after the most elaborate consideration and persistent agitation inside and outside the Council, I am sure that by the example of the gross mistake of 1818, the Hon'ble Member for Engineering would have ever committed himself to such a statement, and what is that statement, I cannot explain myself clear. The panacea proposed is to cut a canal from the Manali and Kuramali rivers at about Arattupuzha, though even the greatest of floods would not affect the sides of the canal. Now this clearly refers to the Pallisseri scheme. I am not arguing for argument sake. I want the thing to be done. Go on, proceed further and see whether I am mistaken or you are mistaken. In this case it will be "to cut a canal". So far as I can understand the Karuvannur is the river made up of the combination of both the rivers. Karuvannur and Manali are here spoken of as alternative schemes as you will see from the context. I have nothing to gain by persisting in a mistake. You can understand what I am saying very well.

" And if the canal overflows, the damage done would be ever so very small. The Chirakkal *thodu* which was cut through high lands is one from which we may well take an example in that it presents no danger due to floods. I have not exactly located my alignment but I have ordered a survey to be done and would be able to put forth a definite scheme before preparing my budget for next year.

Improving the regime of the river.—The river is in some places winding and in others narrowed by artificial bunds. Some of these bunds could advantageously be removed and an extra bridge constructed on the Karuppadanna road to help the Karuvannur river bridge. The one on the road is in a state of disrepair and is declared to be unsafe for traffic. When this is reconstructed, it may be made wider.

Widening the Chirakkal Bridge.—This work is on hand, and when completed will increase the discharging capacity of the Chirakkal *thodu* to double its present discharge. After these works are done, if the required amount of relief is not obtained, we may think of opening the canal from the Muriyad lake, viz., Kakkattuthi or Karuppadanna. But when these are undertaken the flood distress must be reduced considerably.

The Government will be pleased to note in the above that the two main 'Don'ts' I wish to respect in the draining problem of this area are:—

(1) Don't cut open a canal in low ground which necessitates building levees to prevent overflow, and

(2) Don't try to effect relief from floods of such magnitude by one work alone which might concentrate discharge and cause abnormal conditions on new areas".

Now you will see from answer to question No526:

"Will the Government be pleased to state out of the budget allotment for irrigation in 1104 and what are the works proposed to be started?"

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—No. The diversion of the Karuvannur river to the Trichur lake".

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

It is not the Manali river, Sir. You can say that it is a mistake. If you will convince the House that it is a mistake, we will accept it. The point is this. These mistakes have originated and have continued throughout the better part of a century. These mistakes culminated in the tremendous floods of last year. Unless the Chief Engineer, with his engineering knowledge, is prepared to say that there is no problem to be solved, all this argument ought not to have arisen at all. The Hon'ble Member's argument may be put on two heads. First is, what is there, we have lowered the Enamakkal weir and we have opened a bridge there. The damage to crops is not considerable. So that there is no problem to be solved. If that is the mentality of the Government, I have nothing to say. If there is really a problem, what is it? Was not last year's devastation effected under the very eye of our Diwan, our Chief Engineer and our Police Commissioner? A large number of houses have been smeared away last year. Suppose there were a few children in the huts.

Deputy President.—Now that is not the point.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I am coming only to my point. It is conceded that the Irinjalakkuda scheme or the Kakkathuruthi scheme is but a very poor solution. If that is so, why do Government provide only Rs. 5,000 this year for Pallisseri scheme whereas they provided Rs. 30,000 for this market canal scheme? Why have they provided some funds for the mistaken scheme of Pallisseri ? Why did not they provide nearly a lakh on Manali? I concede that even learned Engineers commit mistakes. But why this indifference? I say the action of the Government is difficult to understand. Now we see that a lakh of rupees is recalled and Rs. 5,000 is put there instead, though the scheme is all wrong.

Mr. V. V. Anantapadmanabha Ayyar.—Is that a budget speech? You have taken a long time. This is only a resolution.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I am not aware that Standing Orders have provided particular forms of speech for discussions in the budget and for resolutions. I am speaking so that a great mischief may be averted. Suppose the havocs of flood happened this year also and a few hundred houses lost, who would be responsible for it ? Last year did you not come before us for Rs. 8,000 to pay for damages to houses ? I have nothing to do with the locality in question and am interested only as a citizen of the State. To find that, where a provision of a lakh of rupees had been made last year, nothing but 5,000 rupees has been provided this year and that vigorous operations have been begun in connection with the market canal instead, I respectfully submit, looks worse than apathy. This resolution is not moved

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

here for the fun of it. We are moving it that the Government may do something. We are all acting in our capacity as purveyors of grievances of the public. Now I ask you, if you cannot redress, what else are you going to do? There is a distinction to be made. There are works of two kinds. One is in the nature of luxuries, viz., if we can get a good tramway service in Ernakulam and if the steamers land on our foreshore and other convenient things are arranged, we may feel more comfortable. But supposing the citizens of the State are from year to year suffering from the ravages of floods—I would put the solution of that trouble on a very much higher place than this. The need of Irinjalakkuda people is to have a canal for commercial purposes whereas the need of the inhabitants of these afflicted 21 villages is one which involves their lives. So, my respectful submission is this. As the Hon ble Member for Nellayi said, this is one of the most important resolutions as every Member in this House will realise, because it affects the very life and existence of a sixth of the total population of the State. It is a thing the Government should very seriously consider. If this Pallisseri scheme is not feasible, by all means take any other scheme. I do not want to blame anybody. A gross mistake was committed. But that mistake must be investigated to find out who committed the mistake and who is responsible for that. Because that mistake has cost the poor people heavily and it has cost large sums of money to the Government. Whatever that may be, it has become an inglorious and unworkable scheme on account of this mistake. By all means take some other scheme and execute it. Let us not have another 1104. More than 30,000 people thrown overnight helpless and houseless. Let us not have these thousands of houses destroyed. That is my humble request. With these remarks I commend the original resolution as forcibly as I can. I do not think the original resolution is unworkable. That resolution simply says methods should be found out to drain this river water. There is no specification as to how it should be done. If the flood waters of the Karuvannur river can be diverted through Manali, do it. So that my point is this. Let us not take shelter under an alleged mistake around. Nothing that ought to be done has been so far done. You may work the Irinjalakkuda canal. We have not the least objection. But the Irinjalakkuda canal is not at all a solution of it. So, by all means let us have a scheme undertaken.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Sir, I wish to say a few words. If we have said anything in answer, it should not be construed as anything personal. Naturally one is inclined to take a very pessimistic view of a Department, which, after making necessary

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

preliminaries, comes to this House and gives an assurance—an absolute assurance. From the answers to questions put in this House and also from the various discussions that took place, it will be seen that a certain scheme is undertaken by the Government. There is no use simply saying "this scheme means that and that scheme does not mean that." I am very glad to admit that you are handsome enough to come forward and say that a mistake has been committed and it is not possible to carry out the original intention. We are not in a position to question that statement, the statement of the Chief Engineer, about the possibility or feasibility or otherwise of the scheme. If it is not feasible, then the only thing that we can press upon the Government is that you shall undertake some measure which is feasible to tackle as far as it lies in your power to remove the distress in the flood-affected areas referred to. I am very sorry if I speak on insufficient foundation. This Irinjalakkuda scheme, there is something in it. What that something is I do not exactly want to say. There is something behind it, I can understand. Don't ask me how I understand. When I say something, my conception is proved to be true later on. We shall protest undertaking any work at the public expenditure for luxuries, as mentioned by the Member for Trippunittura, luxuries in the shape of bringing boats—very useful for commerce. But human life is much more precious than all that. We are satisfied and you yourself admit that the Irinjalakkuda scheme will not be a solution for the relief as the Manali scheme. If it be so, I understand it. And as the Member for Trippunittura said, the Irinjalakkuda scheme does not give adequate relief to the extent to which the Manali scheme does. We want you to adopt the next best method to give relief. We are not concerned with your promise. We are concerned to save human life, to save the poor men's houses. The primary duty of the Government is to see that they have done everything in their power to relieve distress and to give security for the lives, which you have not been able to give for the last year. Last year, it was an abnormal flood. These people are afraid of the floods. Therefore, the first and primary consideration is to give relief to these people. Then we shall consider the case of merchants situated in the various parts of the Cochin State, especially in Irinjalakkuda.

The House rose for the day at 5 p. m.

T. K. KRISHNA MENON,

—Secretary to the Council.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly